

VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

"I AM SET FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL."

[PAYABLE WITHIN FOUR MONTHS.]

BRANDON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1842.

VOL. XIV. NO. 32

POETRY.

For the Telegraph.

A DREAM—OR THE AGED AFRICAN.

And dreams, sometimes, are pleasant things,
And sometimes they are not;
Sometimes they call up gone-by scenes
Which long have been forgot.

Sometimes they place before the mind
Things which are yet to be;
In sleep unfettered, unconfin'd,
The mind can wander free.

One evening, late, as I retired,
My weary limbs to rest,
The terrors and sufferings of the slave
Upon my bosom pressed.

Sweet sleep soon o'er my senses stole,
As soft as twilight grey;
My thoughts then wandered uncontrolled
To regions far away.

I thought of Afric's burning clime,
Which I had long'd to see;
There 'neath the shade I sat me down,
Of a Banian tree.

I saw her rude and sable sons,
With sorrow on their brow—
As though they ne'er had known to smile,
Or else forgotten how.

Come by my shady, calm retreat
A winding foot-path lay,
Where soon I saw an aged man
Come toiling on his way.

His wrinkled form was bent with age;
His hair was white and thin,
Which formed a mighty contrast with
The darkness of his skin.

He started when he saw me first,
And trembled with fear;
I tried to see him thus distressed;
He looked—he drew near.

Perhaps, said I, the noontide heat
Hath been too much for thee;
Come hither friend, and take a seat
Beneath this shady tree.

Law thee start, my aged friend—
I saw thy bosom heave—
Why should a lonely stranger's face
Thus cause thee to grieve?

Give me, stranger, he replied,
And listen to my tale,
Which told would make the heart of all
Accept the white man's fall.

Smooth you rising high you see,
There stands my lonely cot—
There all that memory holds most dear,
Once clustered in that spot.

One day as I returned from toil,
Close by my cabin door,
Law my youngest infant child,
Lie bleeding on the floor.

Cold horror thrilled through every vein,
His bleeding form to see;
The awful truth flashed o'er my mind—
I hastened to the sea.

Law a vessel standing off—
Her sails were spreading wide—
There on the deck I saw my wife—
My children by her side.

Their hands and feet with chains were bound,
Then fastened to the floor,
While from their lacerated wounds,
Ran streams of purple gore.

They saw me, shrieked, and shrieked in vain.
I never saw them more.

They say there is a God above,
Who made his creatures free;
And can he look on deeds like this
Of guilt and cruelty?

My aged form is wasting fast;
Death soon my cares will end;
Death comes to set the prisoner free;
Death is the negro's friend.

He rose and loitered on his way—
I never saw him more—
My fancy then re-creased the scene,
To view my native shore.

Where white men boast of liberty,
For which their fathers bled,
While the black curse of slavery rests
On their devoted heads.

I wish to own my native land;
Alas, what shall I say?
My name is stained, and angel's tears
Can't wash that stain away.

Vengeance may sleep—yet heaven will keep
A lasting record there;
God sees the oppressor and the oppressed,
And hears the Negro's prayer.

Wilmington, Essex Co. N. Y.,
April, 1842.

AS THY DAY IS, SO SHALL THY
STRENGTH BE.

Pilgrim! treading feebly on,
Swollen by the Jordan's sea—
Hoping for the shadowy rain,
Looking for the shade in vain;

Travel worn, and faint at heart,
Weak and weary as thou art,
Let thy spirit not repine,
Shade and shelter shall be thine;

Friendly hands to thee shall bring
Water from the cooling spring,
And the voice thou lovest best
Call the wanderer to his rest.

Call the wanderer to his rest,
Call the wanderer to his rest;
Call the wanderer to his rest,
Call the wanderer to his rest.

Call the wanderer to his rest,
Call the wanderer to his rest;
Call the wanderer to his rest,
Call the wanderer to his rest.

Call the wanderer to his rest,
Call the wanderer to his rest;
Call the wanderer to his rest,
Call the wanderer to his rest.

VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

BRANDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 23, 1842.

For the Vermont Telegraph.

A CHRIST SUPERIOR TO MOSES.

Brother Murray:

I have just read a sort of reply to an article published in the Telegraph, which was written by myself, and headed "Christ Superior to Moses." In my opinion, A. D. Low, in his reply, manifested a very unkind, ungenerous and anti-christian spirit. But he must stand or fall at his own master. Had he in a gentleman like manner proved, or attempted to prove, that any statement or position which I took was wrong or unscriptural, I should not entertain the views of him that I now do. His ungentleman like, and infidel expressions & assertions towards me, proving nothing except that he was influenced by a bad spirit, I have nothing to do with, but leave him and his abusive language to go down the falls together. As I have but little time to write, I shall only notice a few of his statements, and that for the good of others.

A. D. Low intimates in very strong language that I was ignorant about the opinion of many, or willfully misrepresented, when I spoke of the belief of many about the ancients. He says, "Doubtless if there is such an idea prevalent, it is erroneous. But the fact is, he has either made a false statement of the idea, or given it in caricature. If he is as well informed as he would appear, or as he ought to be, before preferring such a grave charge upon the christian community in general, he knows there is no such idea prevalent."

A. D. Low has done me injustice by intimating that I accused the christian community in general of believing such things. I only said there was such an idea prevalent, without designating the class that believed such things. I do not know of a well informed christian that believes any such thing. But those that do believe thus are generally bigoted sectarians, who pretend to believe on Jesus Christ, but declare in language too plain to be misunderstood, that his law conflicts with the law of God. These are the ones that "steal the livery of the court of heaven to serve the devil in."

As to the private walks of the ancients, any one knows we can have nothing to do with them any farther than is written. After A. D. L. alleges that my charge is false, he admits that he believes just such things himself. "But that Moses did err in giving the law; or that the ancient prophets, or writers of the Old Testament, did write or prophesy falsely, I do not believe, nor has S. proved." I would ask A. D. L., if Moses did not err when he gave the law of retaliation—"Eye for eye and tooth for tooth," &c., what did Christ repeal it for? Again, if the law of Moses is the express law of God, how can it be that Christ is the Son of God who came to do the will of the Father, while his law conflicts with the law of Moses? Instead of slaughter and destruction, Christ breathes out forgiveness all mixed with mercy and compassion. Can God be against God? If A. D. Low's god is against God, then his god is just no God at all. All those things that Moses wrote which were true and of God, were immutably true, and Christ did not attempt to contradict or repeal them. Any other view than this would declare God to be a changeable being. If Moses and Christ were both instructed in all they did by the Father, it is passing strange that they were instructed so differently. I think I proved definitely that the disciples erred, and that they were as great as John the Baptist, who was as great as any that had arisen before him, consequently as great as Moses. A. D. Low has not even attempted to confute this position. That Moses was not influenced by a wrong spirit, when he gave much of the law and did many violent acts, A. D. L. has not proved. But the very acts that Moses did prove in very strong language that he was influenced by a spirit that he was not aware of. And Christ as much rebuked that spirit, when he repealed every law of retaliation, as he did the spirit that the disciples possessed when he said, "ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of." And as far as fruit is concerned, I do not judge, but know, that A. D. L. knows not what manner of spirit he was of, when he replied to me. If we do not know that a thing is true because Christ said it, how do we know that it is true. Answer.

We know that the sayings of Christ are true, because they harmonize with natural created principles and laws, and with humane feelings. As the laws of nature emanated from God, it cannot be that other laws emanated from him, which do not harmonize with these laws. Carry out the principle of believing a thing is true, barely because Christ said it, and not compare it with natural created laws. Suppose A. D. Low had been taught that Mohammed was the anointed of the Lord, &c., and taught the laws of God. If he did not compare his laws with natural laws, he would be just as likely to believe on Mohammed as Jesus Christ. But by comparing his laws with created ones, we see there is little or no harmony, while the laws of Christ perfectly harmonize with the laws of nature, which are the created laws of God. The greatest evidence I have that Christ is the chosen one of God is, that his law perfectly agrees with the diagram, or created laws. But cannot we know any thing except what Christ has told us? Christ never told us that fire was hot; yet the child knows it. Christ never told us how to build steam engines, railroads, ships, houses, &c., yet these things are well understood. Neither did he teach us the art of printing; and it has been known only about four centuries. He never taught the use of the mariner's compass; and it has been known but about six centuries. He taught nothing of anatomy, or chemistry, and but little philosophy or astronomy; still these things have been lately found out, and are considerably understood. Thus we see that although Christ taught nothing but the truth, yet he did not teach us every thing—neither was it necessary. Therefore, inasmuch as the sayings of Christ harmonize with created principles, and the sayings of others harmonize with his sayings, they too must harmonize with created principles; and for this reason we are bound to believe them.

If A. D. L. is not satisfied with my exposition on this point, and he will let me know it, I will try again. He says I have impeached God's chosen witnesses, and wish me to sustain my suit, by showing what part or parts of their testimony is true and what is untrue. This I will do with all my heart. As I have before said things or sayings are true that harmonize with created laws and principles, and no others. Let A. D. L. grasp at a straw, and join issue with me in this respect, if he thinks best. I prove that Christ was not as really the author of the Mosaic law as he is of the law of the gospel, from the fact that they conflict with each other in many respects; therefore these conflicting parts could not both come from the same source. Moses says, kill and destroy your enemies. Christ says, pray for them—love and forgive them and do them good. Thus I prove the negative, at the request of A. D. L., when it properly belonged to him to prove the affirmative. Will he do it if he can? Will A. D. L. say it was not the law of God that Christ alluded to when he said—"Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." Now if the law of Moses all emanated from God, Christ did destroy some of the law of God, for he destroyed a part of the law of Moses. A. D. L. has not proved that God talked much with Moses with an audible voice. He contends that Moses and Christ are equal. No wonder that he is at loss which to obey, the law of Christ or Moses, when they conflict. Marvel not if he chooses the law of vengeance and retaliation. He has not proved that Moses was equal with Christ. Because there was a likeness between Christ and Moses, it does not prove that they were exactly equal. The apostle, speaking of Christ, says, Col. ii: 9—"For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the God Head bodily." 2 Cor. iv: 4—"In whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine upon them." Here Christ is called the image of God. "Heb. i: 3: "Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." No such things are said about Moses. Nor was he equal with Christ in power. See Christ forgive sins, raise the dead, heal the sick, and broken in heart, open the eyes of the blind, unstop the ears of

the deaf, loose the tongues of the dumb, and cast out devils. Could Moses do all this? If not, he was not equal with Christ.

If A. D. L. wishes to converse with me through the columns of the Telegraph, he must write with more candor and hold Christ a little higher than he has done, or I shall not feel bound to pay any sort of attention to him. If he has sound arguments, I would like to hear them, and reply to them; but mere fault finding amounts to but little. Truth will stand. A. D. L. probably knows if the position I took be sustained—Non-Resistance is sustained also—the law of mercy is sustained—while the law of violence is overthrown. This, I imagine, is what disturbs him. But let him see to it that he is not found fighting against God.

I never contended that God's law was imperfect—but the reverse; for as God is perfect, so is his law perfect also. It is infidelity to accuse God of imperfection, or fallibility, as A. D. L. has done. "Let God be true, but every man a liar. It is written—There shall no man see me and live." "No man hath seen God at any time." Yet A. D. L. asserts that Moses frequently conversed with him face to face.

J. A. SPEAR.

For the Telegraph.

REVIVAL IN GRAFTON.

Brother Murray:—I have delayed transmitting to you an account of the revival in Grafton until the present time, because I have been much pressed for time, and have thought you might hesitate to publish another article from a pen so polluted and so destitute of candor as mine. Yet as I design ever to fulfil my promises, and as it may be interesting to some of your readers to hear what God has done for his cause and for sinners, I send you the following:

About the last of November and first of December last, a very interesting state of religious feeling existed in the church, and it was evident to the discerning christian, that a good degree of solemnity and seriousness rested upon the minds of the ungodly. Indeed, such was the appearance of society, that several members of the church cherished a sanguine hope, that very soon the windows of heaven would be opened and a copious shower of divine grace enjoyed. But their expectations were cut off; for just at this crisis of feeling, Col. Miller arrived in town and tarried about a week, lecturing upon Slavery and Intemperance. Though his lectures, as to character and spirit, gave general satisfaction, and were the means of promoting the interests of Temperance, yet when he left town, it appeared as if all seriousness was dissipated, and that the Holy Ghost had taken his flight from the people. Apparent indifference prevailed, several weeks. At length some of the brethren began to feel that such a state was absolutely intolerable, and that special efforts must be made to revive the church and to save the lost. Accordingly, the Saturday previous to the third Sabbath in January, was appointed as a day of fasting, humiliation and prayer.

That indeed was a memorable day; the meeting was well attended, solemn and interesting. The spirit rested upon the brethren, constraining them with deep emotions of soul to confess their faults one to another, and to pray with fervency for the conversion of sinners. From that time, there appeared to be a gradual increase of interest in the church. As it had been thought expedient to hold a series of meetings, the services of brother M. D. Miller, of Windham, were secured for a season. He commenced his labors on the Monday evening following the fast, and continued to preach two and three sermons a day, until a week from the next Wednesday, when he was joined by brother Burrows of Ludlow, whose labors were highly acceptable and useful.

Though there appeared to be an increase of interest among christians, still the prospect as to the conversion of sinners remained dark, until the second Tuesday of the meeting. On the afternoon of that day, the powers of darkness seemed to give way before the truth and spirit of God, like a fortification across a mighty stream whose waters had been stayed until they were so accumulated that they could no longer be resisted. The anxious-seats were filled with inquirers, deeply impressed with a sense of their criminality and exposure to the wrath of God. During one week, several new cases of conversion daily occurred. The church has probably never witnessed a more solemn and interesting week, since its organization. The meeting was continued every evening, and nearly every day, about four weeks, during which there were between 30 and 40 hopeful conversions. As the fruits of the revival, 34 have been baptized into the church, all of whom give very satisfactory evidence of genuine piety. A very interesting state of feeling now exists among both saints and sinners.

The labors of brethren Miller and Burrows, will be held in long and grateful remembrance by the people of Grafton. When we reflect upon our former coldness and ingratitude, and upon what God has wrought in our midst, we are constrained to say with the Psalmist, "The mercy of the Lord endureth forever."

Yours as ever,
D. M. CRANE.

Grafton, April 26, 1842.

P. S. I would simply say to you that I have been dismissed from the pastoral charge of the church in Grafton, and commenced laboring with the North Springfield church.

D. M. C.

REMARKS.

Is that "religious feeling" genuine which can be "dissipated" or driven away by lectures of the "character and spirit" described by brother Crane? I think such religion needs examining, to see whether it be "from above." Will it reform and save men? Is the heart, in such cases, reached through the understanding? Did our Savior teach a religion that would be dissipated by coming in contact with the cause of benevolence? It appears that friend Miller "reasoned of righteousness" [ceasing oppression] and "temperance"—two of the very things that Paul reasoned of when he caused Felix to tremble. But in this modern case it seems the trembling and fleeing was on the part of religion! What is pure and undefiled religion?

The article below was sent me by an esteemed friend, in the form of a slip cut from a paper, without any credit given. So far as I have any impressions in regard to the piece, and any means of tracing its identity, I should say it was from the Liberator—but can not be certain.

CIVILIZATION.

False views of civilization prevail. The imperfect sign is taken to be the thing it partly signifies; as the various shadowings forth of the Deity in His works have been made gods by men, and worshipped in His stead. True civilization does not consist in the triumphs of art, nor even in the glories of literature. It is not made up of the refinements and elegancies of outward life, nor of the graces and accomplishments of the mind or the manner. It is not Art, Literature, Elegance, Comfort, or Politeness, but the spiritual condition of which all these are the partial manifestations. The statue, the picture, the epic poem show that civilization exists. The artist, the bard, the curious artificer proclaim her presence, and prophesy her triumphs. All these could not be, unless Civilization had afforded them her protection. But the Civilization that is sufficient for these things may be but of an imperfect development. These are the trophies which mark the earliest stages of the progress of civilization. As she advances, higher victories will be marked by loftier and more enduring monuments. The highest Civilization is the result of the most perfect reverence for all the rights of others, and the most entire practical respect for them. This implies complete control of the passions, and a recognition of the truth that our own rights can never be purchased or secured at the expense of the rights of others. It springs from the perception of the reality of the brotherhood of man, and of the closeness of the tie of a common Parent which unites the race together. In proportion as an individual has attained to this reverence for the rights of others, which makes him willing rather to endure the loss of his own rights than to infringe upon those of others, he is entitled to the title of a civilized man. In proportion as a community is made of such individuals, is it deserving of the appellation of a civilized community. The world has not yet advanced beyond a semi-barbarous condition. A jealous care of their own rights, honor and dignity, is the purpose and the pride of existing civil organizations, and of the individuals that compose them. The rights of others are trampled upon with the most wanton disregard, whenever they come in collision with the interests, real or imaginary, of the individual or the state. The inalienable character of the rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, was proclaimed in solemn congress by the fathers of American liberty, (as they are called,) and the very first measures they took to establish their own profession of these rights was to invade these rights and destroy them in the persons of the British troops and their American abettors. And when they had prevailed in the conflict of brute force, and driven their invaders away, they sat down to devise means to secure to themselves and their posterity the eternal enjoyment of these blessings. And the principle on which they built their citadel in which they trusted, was the right on the part of the body politic, derived from the natural right of self-defence assumed to be possessed by every individual, of depriving any person, or any number of persons of their lives, liberties or property, who infringed upon or threatened their own rights to these blessings, whether in the shape of a foreign or domestic enemy. And what was more obviously, though not more really, incongruous still, they recognized the system of slavery, which impiously denies all natural rights to one sixth of the people, and pledged themselves and their children forever to maintain it, should the oppressed imitate their own example

of a resort to arms for a redress of their grievances. They had not attained to the true philosophy which teaches that the rights of one man, or of many men, can never be secured by the destruction of those of another—but, on the contrary, that they must be weakened and endangered by every example of disregard for the least of the rights of others—that the rights of men are so closely bound up together, that an injury to one is an injury to all, and is sure to be felt by all. But the history of the country is fast demonstrating the truth of this philosophy. Men will learn at last, by sad experience, that the real source of the misrule and misconduct, public and private, under which the land groans, is the contempt of the rights of others which is interwoven with the very texture of the false state of society which prevails. Why should the rights of opinion, of utterance, of property, of locomotion, be safe from mobs, from bank directors, from slaveholders and their lynching abettors, when the inalienable nature of the right to life is denied by all, as the fundamental principle of their social compact? If the right which contains all others be disregarded, why should the lesser ones be respected? We disguise our barbarisms, and then boast of them as proofs of civilization. We pierce the skies with a granite obelisk to commemorate a murderous inroad upon the rights of others, while we regard with disgust the string of scalps which represent precisely the same idea in the mind of the Indian. We build and equip ships of war, and erect fortifications, by the aid of the highest science and skill, while we look with contempt upon the tomahawk and knife. We bedizen our homes with gold lace and coats of many colors, while we disdain the painted skin, the string of bears' teeth, the medicine bag and tinkling rings which distinguish for the very same purpose the Pawnee brave. This is about the amount of modern civilization. Civilization destroys men by thousands with artillery and congregate rockets. Barbarism kills them by paltry scores with a hatchet and bow and arrows. The principle of both conditions is the same—the attainment or defence of our own rights by the destruction of the right of others.

Civilization dawned when men first began to perceive that the enjoyment of their own rights depended upon their showing some respect to those of others. As this idea has been developed and lived out, has civilization advanced. Thus states arose for the purpose of mutual protection.—Thus laws were established for the security of life, liberty and property. From this partial civilization have sprung science, literature, art—the refinements that adorn and sweeten life. This degree of civilization, however, is proved by the history of the world to be compatible with a very small degree of theoretical respect for rights, and a very great degree of practical disregard for them. For proof, read the history of the most civilized nations of ancient & modern times—not forgetting our own. The cause of this imperfect triumph of civilization is to be found in the fact that selfishness has ever been, and still is, the central, vivifying principle of what is called civilization. As the most refined and polished nation of antiquity branded as barbarians all who lived beyond the borders of Greece, so modern civilization begins and ends with self. It has no active principle that embraces all mankind, and recognizes the equal rights of all. Therefore it is that scarce any real advance has been made in civilization, none at all in the advancement of arts and literature—for more than two thousand years. Therefore it is that Christianity has so slightly improved the condition of mankind. The great Reformer, whose mission was to civilize mankind and deliver them from the tyranny of their lusts and passions, and to make them free indeed, is but just beginning to be understood. He was indeed a civilized man—who taught and practised the most reverent regard for rights—and who showed by his example that the rights of others are to be respected even at the expense of our own. When this truth shall have pervaded the general mind, it will be manifested by an outward civilization, of which the highest degree ever yet attained by man is but the morning twilight to the perfect day. Then Justice will descend from heaven, to which she fled of old from the wickedness of man. Then Peace and Abundance will make all the borders of the earth to rejoice. Then Elegance and Refinement will be the blessings of all, instead of the ornaments of the few. Health of body and of mind will spring from temperance and virtue. Armies, navies, gibbets, penitentiaries, and all the complicated machinery of government, will be regarded as the signs of an unsound state of public sentiment as was shown to exist by the faggots of the martyr or the gallows of the wretch. The great truths of the brotherhood of the human race, and of the duty of regarding the rights of others as our own, and of maintaining them even at the cost of our own, which Jesus Christ held up in a blaze of moral light which has endured the thick darkness of eighteen hundred benighted centuries, and will at last disperse it, will then have produced their beneficial results, and men will dwell in peace and joy, delivered from fear and sin, in the fulness of the presence of God. Then true worship will ascend continually to the Father from the altar of grateful hearts; every house and every field will become a temple; every man will be a

of a resort to arms for a redress of their grievances. They had not attained to the true philosophy which teaches that the rights of one man, or of many men, can never be secured by the destruction of those of another—but, on the contrary, that they must be weakened and endangered by every example of disregard for the least of the rights of others—that the rights of men are so closely bound up together, that an injury to one is an injury to all, and is sure to be felt by all. But the history of the country is fast demonstrating the truth of this philosophy. Men will learn at last, by sad experience, that the real source of the misrule and misconduct, public and private, under which the land groans, is the contempt of the rights of others which is interwoven with the very texture of the false state of society which prevails. Why should the rights of opinion, of utterance, of property, of locomotion, be safe from mobs, from bank directors, from slaveholders and their lynching abettors, when the inalienable nature of the right to life is denied by all, as the fundamental principle of their social compact? If the right which contains all others be disregarded, why should the lesser ones be respected? We disguise our barbarisms, and then boast of them as proofs of civilization. We pierce the skies with a granite obelisk to commemorate a murderous inroad upon the rights of others, while we regard with disgust the string of scalps which represent precisely the same idea in the mind of the Indian. We build and equip ships of war, and erect fortifications, by the aid of the highest science and skill, while we look with contempt upon the tomahawk and knife. We bedizen our homes with gold lace and coats of many colors, while we disdain the painted skin, the string of bears' teeth, the medicine bag and tinkling rings which distinguish for the very same purpose the Pawnee brave. This is about the amount of modern civilization. Civilization destroys men by thousands with artillery and congregate rockets. Barbarism kills them by paltry scores with a hatchet and bow and arrows. The principle of both conditions is the same—the attainment or defence of our own rights by the destruction of the right of others.

Civilization dawned when men first began to perceive that the enjoyment of their own rights depended upon their showing some respect to those of others. As this idea has been developed and lived out, has civilization advanced. Thus states arose for the purpose of mutual protection.—Thus laws were established for the security of life, liberty and property. From this partial civilization have sprung science, literature, art—the refinements that adorn and sweeten life. This degree of civilization, however, is proved by the history of the world to be compatible with a very small degree of theoretical respect for rights, and a very great degree of practical disregard for them. For proof, read the history of the most civilized nations of ancient & modern times—not forgetting our own. The cause of this imperfect triumph of civilization is to be found in the fact that selfishness has ever been, and still is, the central, vivifying principle of what is called civilization. As the most refined and polished nation of antiquity branded as barbarians all who lived beyond the borders of Greece, so modern civilization begins and ends with self. It has no active principle that embraces all mankind, and recognizes the equal rights of all. Therefore it is that scarce any real advance has been made in civilization, none at all in the advancement of arts and literature—for more than two thousand years. Therefore it is that Christianity has so slightly improved the condition of mankind. The great Reformer, whose mission was to civilize mankind and deliver them from the tyranny of their lusts and passions, and to make them free indeed, is but just beginning to be understood. He was indeed a civilized man—who taught and practised the most reverent regard for rights—and who showed by his example that the rights of others are to be respected even at the expense of our own. When this truth shall have pervaded the general mind, it will be manifested by an outward civilization, of which the highest degree ever yet attained by man is but the morning twilight to the perfect day. Then Justice will descend from heaven, to which she fled of old from the wickedness of man. Then Peace and Abundance will make all the borders of the earth to rejoice. Then Elegance and Refinement will be the blessings of all, instead of the ornaments of the few. Health of body and of mind will spring from temperance and virtue. Armies, navies, gibbets, penitentiaries, and all the complicated machinery of government, will be regarded as the signs of an unsound state of public sentiment as was shown to exist by the faggots of the martyr or the gallows of the wretch. The great truths of the brotherhood of the human race, and of the duty of regarding the rights of others as our own, and of maintaining them even at the cost of our own, which Jesus Christ held up in a blaze of moral light which has endured the thick darkness of eighteen hundred benighted centuries, and will at last disperse it, will then have produced their beneficial results, and men will dwell in peace and joy, delivered from fear and sin, in the fulness of the presence of God. Then true worship will ascend continually to the Father from the altar of grateful hearts; every house and every field will become a temple; every man will be a